UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,156	01/05/2000	Edward L Bayiates	WCS-00201	1311

26339 7590 04/22/2005

PATENT GROUP
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART
EXCHANGE PLACE, 53 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, CAM Y T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2162	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/478,156	BAYIATES, EDWARD L	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,25-27 and 50-100* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19, 25-27, 50-100* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 50 and 67 in the amendment filed on 1/18/2005. Claims 1-19, 25-27, 50-100 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the combination of references Stiegemeier and Hilster does not teach the claimed limitation "receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data".

Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as each document contain one or more print formats. The application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format. The above information indicates the system has received the viewable document that

includes document data as content data and print formats as format data (col. 7, lines 17-25),

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as the application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document, which is stored in a server, is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format or other compatible viewer. This information indicates the print format is applied to document data to product the viewable document. This document is represented as a visual form (col. 7, lines 19-22);

"storing the identified content data" as displaying data from a template before the user closes the program. The user optionally elects to save the documents to a local device (col. 10, lines 55-65),

"wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template" as existing data management systems have defined field sizes, and user are either restricted in the amount of data that can be entered in a field, or required to use forms that include large blank spaces to accommodate large entries. Template component contains user Interface view definitions, print and print preview definitions. The above information shows that Template is different from entered data as content data and defined field sizes as format data (col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 7, lines 50-67).

Stiegemeier does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

Applicant argued that the combination of DuFresne and Hilster does not teach the claimed limitation "receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template; and storing the identified content data as at least one tag value".

DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as (col. 18, lines 35-45; col. 8, lines 60-65);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. The #page tag extracts the data in the database. This above information shows that the extraction instructions can be included in the template to extract HTML data from the text area of the template. The system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output webpage and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25);

"storing the identified content data as at least one tag value" as (col. 17, lines 30-67).

DuFresne does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is

applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents to DuFresne's system in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

Applicant argued that the combination of DuFresne and Hilster does not teach the claimed limitation "receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented, wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data; applying a template to the visual form of data; analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, said template including extraction instructions

indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template".

DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data presenting a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be .....visually represented" as (col. 6, lines 55-67);

"applying a template to the visual form of data" as (col. 8, lines 60-67);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The above information shows that the system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output web page and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data
(col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 18, lines 23-25);

"said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data" as the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. This information shows that the extraction instructions can be included in the template to show how to extract HTML data from the text area of the template (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25);

DuFresne does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

For the above reason, examiner believed that rejection of the last office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 15-19, 25-27, 94, and 98-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier et al (USP 6192381) in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939).

As to claims 1, 17, and 19, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as each document contain one or more print formats. The application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format. The above information indicates the system has received the viewable document that includes document data as content data and print formats as format data (col. 7, lines 17-25),

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as the application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document, which is stored in a server,

is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format or other compatible viewer. This information indicates the print format is applied to document data to product the viewable document. This document is represented as a visual form (col. 7, lines 19-22);

"storing the identified content data" as displaying data from a template before the user closes the program. The user optionally elects to save the documents to a local device (col. 10, lines 55-65).

"wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template" as existing data management systems have defined field sizes, and user are either restricted in the amount of data that can be entered in a field, or required to use forms that include large blank spaces to accommodate large entries. Template component contains user Interface view definitions, print and print preview definitions. The above information shows that Template is different from entered data as content data and defined field sizes as format data (col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 7, lines 50-67).

Stiegemeier does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 2, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "normalizing the data representing the visual form of data" as (col. 11, lines 15-30).

As to claim 3, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the data is normalized .....form of data" as (col. 11, lines 15-55).

As to claim 7, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the data representing the visual form of data comprises.....outputting ....by a printer" as (col. 13, lines 65-67; col. 14, lines 1-5).

As to claim 9, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the template includes .....from the received data" as (col. 11, lines 15-40).

As to claim 15, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the received data further represents a plurality of visual forms of data" as (fig. 5B).

As to claim 16, Stiegemier teaches the claimed limitation "storing the identified content data .....: storing .....visual forms of data" as (fig. 5B-9).

As to claims 18, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation:

"a input port that receives data representing a visual form of data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template component contains information about the nature of the data that are contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview definitions; data entry and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit, view, or print a document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document. The template contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data fields. The above information shows that the system receives documents from database servers. A document is presented as a visual form of data. Subject data is represented as subject data. Template information is represented as format data which indicates the manner the content data is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as the application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document which is stored in a server,

is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format or other compatible viewer. This information indicates the print format is applied to document data to product the viewable document. This document is represented as a visual form (col. 7, lines 19-22);

"a storage media that stores the identified content data" as (col. 5, lines 60-65).

"wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template" as existing data management systems have defined field sizes, and user are either restricted in the amount of data that can be entered in a field, or required to use forms that include large blank spaces to accommodate large entries. Template component contains user Interface view definitions, print and print preview definitions. The above information shows that Template is different from entered data as content data and defined field sizes as format data (col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 7, lines 50-67).

Stiegemeier does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor that analyzes said visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and

formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As claims 25, 26, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the .....represented" as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template component contains information about the nature of the data that are contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview definitions; data entry and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit, view, or print a document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document. The template contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data fields. The above information shows that the system has included an input port to receive documents from database servers. A document is presented as a visual form of data. Subject data is represented as subject data. Template information is represented as format data which indicates the manner the content data is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as the application combines the document data with the print format to

create a new printable document. Currently, this document which is stored in a server, is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format or other compatible viewer. This information indicates the print format is applied to document data to product the viewable document. This document is represented as a visual form (col. 7, lines 19-22);

"wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template" as existing data management systems have defined field sizes, and user are either restricted in the amount of data that can be entered in a field, or required to use forms that include large blank spaces to accommodate large entries. Template component contains user Interface view definitions, print and print preview definitions. The above information shows that Template is different from entered data as content data and defined field sizes as format data (col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 7, lines 50-67),

"initiating performance of an action based on results of said identifying at least some of the content data" as (fig.5B).

Stiegemeier does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As claim 27, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation:

"an input port that receives data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as application documents, which is stored in file server or database server, are a compound collection of template information and subject data. The application template component contains information about the nature of the data that are contained in document; user interface view definitions; print and print preview definitions; data entry and editing validation requirements. When a user wants to edit, view, or print a document, the application ensures to edit, view or print a document. The template contains instructions for formatting the document data e.g., names of data fields. The above information shows that the system has included an input port to receive documents from database servers. A document is presented as a visual form of data. Subject data is represented as subject data. Template information is represented as format data which indicates the manner the content data is to be visually represented (col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 8, lines 15-20; col. 10,lines 5-10);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as the application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document which is stored in a server, is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format or other compatible viewer. This information indicates the print format is applied to document data to product the viewable document. This document is represented as a visual form (col. 7, lines 19-22);

"wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template" as existing data management systems have defined field sizes, and user are either restricted in the amount of data that can be entered in a field, or required to use forms that include large blank spaces to accommodate large entries. Template component contains user Interface view definitions, print and print preview definitions. The above information shows that Template is different from entered data as content data and defined field sizes as format data (col. 1, lines 59-67; col. 7, lines 50-67),

"initiating performing ....content data" as (fig.5B).

Stiegemeier fails to teach the claimed limitation "a processor that analyzes said visual form of data using a template and identifies at least some of the content data in accordance with said template after said data format is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is

represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 94, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said visual form of data represents at least one of a display format and a print format of said content data" as (figs. 1-6), "said analyzing applies said template to one of said display format and print format....applying said format data to said content data" as (col. 7, lines 19-22).

As to claim 98, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving content data and format data, wherein said format data is applied to said content data producing one of a display format and a print format of said content data" as the application combines the document data with the print format to create a new printable document. Currently, this document, which is stored in a server, is viewable by Microsoft Word or other rich text format or other compatible viewer. This

information indicates the print format is applied to document data to product the viewable document. This document is represented as a visual form (col. 7, lines 19-22);

"applying a template to one of said display format and print format of said content data when said format data is applied to said content data" as (col. 10, lines 5-55).

Stiegemeier does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "identifying, using said template, a portion of said content data when said content data is represented in one of said display format and said print format".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 99, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "storing said portion of identified content data" as (fig. 4).

As to claim 100, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said template content data and said format data are different from said template" as (fig. 5B).

4. Claims 4-6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939) and further in view of Graefe et al (USP 6298342).

As to claim 4, Stiegemeier and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 2, except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized.....at least two coordinate systems... into a common coordinate system". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitations "the visual form of data is characterized....at least two coordinate systems" as (col. 1, lines 35-60) , "wherein normalizing the data .....into a common coordinate system" as (col. 1, liens 35-60; col. 2, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of the engine searches the database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of data. For example, a user may even select data from a database table in the Microsoft Access database component of Microsoft Office, transfer it as a single object to Excel component as a rectangle of

spreadsheet cell to Stiegemeier's system in order to display a form in different dimensions following user's desire.

As to claim 5, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the common coordiate.....visual form of data " as (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5).

As to claim 6, Stiegemeier discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 4, except the claimed limitation "the template.....on the common coordinate system". However, Stiegemeier teaches that extract the data from the document and format data in accordance with template instructions. The document may optionally include a code, which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying data. A template may use instructions to define a display including data location (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's teaching of extract the data from the document and format data in accordance with template instructions. The document may optionally include a code, which identifies the appropriate template that will provide the format for displaying data. A template may use instructions to define a display, which include data location in order to display different type of data in proper format or location on screen following user's desire.

As to claim 10, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes ....on coordinate system" as (col. 11, lines 1-15), except the

claimed limitation "the visual form of data .....by the coordinate system". However, Graefe teaches that the engine searches the database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of data. For example, a user may even select data from a database table in the Microsoft Access database component of Microsoft Office, transfer it as a single object to Excel component as a rectangle of spreadsheet cell above claimed limitation in col. 1, lines 30-65.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of the engine searches the database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of data to Stiegemeier's system in order to display a form in different dimensions following user's desire.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939). And further in view of Geaghan (USP 5790114).

As to claim 8, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "the operating system layer is Windows operating system" as (fig. 3), except the claimed limitation "the data representing the visual form of data is a Windows metafile". However, Geaghan teaches the Windows metafile (col. 19, lines 55-60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Stiegemeier's teaching of Windows metafile to Stiegemeier's system in order to provide a system which enhances the ability to create, retain, and review information.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939) and further in view of Graefe and Ishikawa (USP 5933527).

As to claim 11, Stiegemeier discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 9, except the claimed limitation" the visual form of data.....identifying at least some of the content data in the direction". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as displaying a form database with different perspective (col. 1, lines 30-65). Ishikawa teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes information with respect to location of a reference marker and a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions" as a searching range for extracting the areas of said facial feature is set for

each facial feature to be extracted based on the coordinate data of said specific points (col. 24, lines 40-50);

"wherein identifying .....content data in the direction" as (col. 24, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of displaying a form database with different perspective and Ishikawa's teaching of a searching range for extracting the areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the coordinate data of said specific points to Stiegemeier's system in order to display a beautiful image on screen to a user.

7. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stiegemeier in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939) and further in view of Maejima et al (USP 5327568).

As to claim 12, stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitations:

"displaying a sample ...data" as (fig. 5);

"receiving data from a user....data" as (fig. 5B).

Stiegemeier fails to teaches the claimed limitation "forming the extraction instruction.....by the user". However, Maejima teaches that extracting the instruction name from the instruction name section in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate sections 825 (col. 7, lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to apply Maejima teaching of instruction name from the instruction

name section in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate sections 825 to Stiegemeier's system in order to display data in proper format following user's desire.

As to claim 13, Stiegemeier and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 12, except the claimed limitation "storing the extraction instruction". However, Maejima teaches that the instruction template and the information of input and output data of the instructions are previously stored in the file. This information shows that all of instruction template is stored in file including extraction information (col. 7, lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Maejima's teaching of storing instruction template to Stiegemeier's system and Stiegemeier's system in order to form a format data for displaying.

As to claim 14, Stiegemeier teaches the claimed limitation "storing the extraction.....visual form of data" as (col. 10, lines 30-67; col. 11, lines 1-5).

8. Claims 50, 52-54, 67, 68, 70, 72-74, 87-89, 92, 93 and 95-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939).

As to claims 50 and 92, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data representing a visual form of data comprising content data and format data indicating the manner in which the content data is to be visually represented" as (col. 18, lines 35-45; col. 8, lines 60-65);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. The #page tag extracts the data in the database. This above information shows that the extraction instructions can be included in the template to extract HTML data from the text area of the template. The system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output webpage and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25);

"storing the identified content data as at least one tag value" as (col. 17, lines 30-67).

DuFresne does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using a template and identifying at least some of the content data in accordance with said template having an extraction instruction after said format data is

applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claims 52 and 72, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "creating template" as if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. Selecting delete will remove the template from the database. This information shows that the system includes the claimed creating template before deleting template (col. 10, lines 25-33).

As to claims 53 and 73, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "editing said template" as (col. 10, lines 25-33).

As to claims 54 and 74, DuFresne discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 53, except the claimed limitation "editing said extraction instruction included in said template". However, DuFresne teaches that if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 10, lines 25-30). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source in order to allow a user to maintain a database.

As to claims 67 and 93, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving data .....visually represented" as (col. 6, lines 55-67);

"applying a template to the visual form of data" as (col. 8, lines 60-67);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The above information shows that the system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output web page and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data

files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 18, lines 23-25);

"said template including extraction instructions indicating how to extract content data from the visual form of data" as the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. This information shows that the extraction instructions can be included in the template to show how to extract HTML data from the text area of the template (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25);

"extracting a tag value for at least one tag identified in said template" as (col. 18, lines 45-55; col. 24, lines 24-25).

DuFresne does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "analyzing said visual form of data using said template and identifying a portion of the content data in accordance with said template after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and

formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 68, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "applying the template to previously stored data" as (col. 13, 50-60).

As to claim 70, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing said tag value in association with a report corresponding to said visual form of data" as (col. 11, lines 30-35)

As to claim 87, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitations:

"a data receiver.....the content data is to be visually displayed" as (fig. 11A& 11B);

"wherein said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data" as shown in fig. 8, the template/database pair for each element. In a preferred embodiment, each template specifies what information from the database a corresponding output web page should contain and how the page should look. The above information shows that the system specifies each element of the database to identify which template corresponding to a web page for output web page and how the web page should look. As disclosed in specification page 8, applicant defines that data

files are presented as the visual forms of data. Thus, This database, which is a file composed of records, is represented as a visual form of data (col. 9, lines 30-55; col. 18, lines 23-25);

"a database in which said template is stored" as (col. 13, lines 50-55; col. 6, lines 55-65; col. 8, lines 60-67).

"identifies a portion of the content data used in generating at least one tag value" as a template 308 associated with the selected element is retrieved and processed by the server 300. A template includes HTML tags and tag extensions to define and build a Web page. This information shows that the system has included a template runner to identify the selected element associated with a template, which includes tags (fig. 14; col. 13, lines 50-55; col. 6, lines 55-65; col. 8, lines 60-67);

DuFresne does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a template runner that applies a template to said visual form of the data and analyzes said visual form of data using said template and after said format data is applied to said content data to produce said visual form of data, wherein said content data and said format data are different from said template".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

As to claim 88, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "a template builder that create said template and stores said template to said database" as (col. 10, lines 20-35).

As to claim 89, DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "wherein said template includes at least one extraction....form of data". However, DuFresne teaches that the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 24, lines 24-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of the processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. The #page tag extracts the data in the database to Sparks's system in order to return a correct form including a sign which tells a user what kind of text for a form, display the form in proper format, and provide emphasis to words in a Web page in different ways.

As to claims 95-97, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said visual form of data ...content data" as (col. 17, lines 55-67; col. 18, lines 1-5).

9. Claims 51, 71, 90 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of de Hilster et al (or hereinafter "Hilster") (USP 5999939) and further in view of Graefe and Ishikawa.

As to claims 51 and 71, DuFresne and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 67, except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized by at least .....to location of a reference marker and a direction in at least one of said plurality of dimensions, and wherein identifying .....portion of the content data in the direction". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as (col. 1, lines 30-65). Ishikawa teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes information with respect to location of a reference marker and a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions" as (col. 24, lines 40-50);

"wherein identifying .....content data in the direction" as (col. 24, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of displaying a form database with different perspective and Ishikawa's teaching of a searching range for extracting the areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the

coordinate data of said specific points to DuFresne's system in order to display a beautiful image on screen to a user.

As to claim 90, DuFresne discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 87, except the claimed limitation "the visual form of data is characterized by at least one of a plurality of dimensions; the extraction instruction includes information with respect to a location of a reference marker and a direction in one of a plurality of dimensions, and said template runner searcher in the direction for identify said portion of content data in the direction".

However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitation "the visual form of data.....a direction in one of plurality of dimensions" as (col. 1, lines 30-65). Ishikawa teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction includes information with respect to location of a reference marker and a direction in one of the plurality of dimensions.....portion of content data in the direction" as (col. 24, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of displaying a form database with different perspective and Ishikawa's teaching of a searching range for extracting the areas of said facial feature is set for each facial feature to be extracted based on the coordinate data of said specific points to DuFresne's system in order to display a beautiful image on screen to a user.

As to claim 91, DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "template builder is used to edit and review the extraction instruction included in said template". However, DuFresne teaches that if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source. This information shows that the system has included a template builder to edit a template, which can include the extraction instruction. Thus, when editing a template, the system can edit the extraction instruction too (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 10, lines 25-30). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply DuFresne's teaching of if a template has been modified, selecting update will implement revisions to the present template. The processor extracts the HTML data from the text area of the template as the hypertext source in order to allow a user to maintain a database.

10. Claims 55-58 and 75-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hilster and further in view of Maejima.

As to claims 55 and 75, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation:

"displaying a sample visual form of data" as (col. 13, lines 15-30). DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "receiving user location data .....displayed sample visual form of data; forming the extraction .....data selected by the user". However, Maejima teaches that extracting the instruction name from the instruction name section in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate

sections 825 (col. 7, lines 60-65; col. 15, line 45-60). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to apply Maejima teaching of instruction name from the instruction name section in the instruction templates after designer input data sets, input pin position coordinate sections 825 to Spark's system in order to display data in proper format following user's desire.

As to claims 56 and 76, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing the extraction instruction" as (col. 11, lines 30-35).

As to claims 57 and 77, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing the identified content data in association with data.....visual forms of data" as (col. 11, lines 30-35; col. 10, lines 5-30).

As to claims 58 and 78, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "storing the identified .....plurality of visual forms of data" as (col. 13, lines 15-30).

11. Claims 59-62 and 79-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hilster and further in view of Graefe.

As to claims 59 and 79 DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "normalizing the data representing the visual form of data". However, Graefe teaches the claimed limitations "the visual form of data is characterized....at least two coordinate systems" as (col. 1, lines 35-60) , "wherein normalizing the data .....into a common

coordinate system" as (col. 1, liens 35-60; col. 2, lines 10-25). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Graefe's teaching of the engine searches the database and returns to the user a result, usually in the form of a relational table, which matches the specifications of the query. Wherein databases are conceptually multidimensional, based upon axes such as time {day, month, year}, locate {city, store, state}. A user often finds it useful and may wish to view them from different perspectives. From this point of view, the ability to transform a database table from one perspective to another-to rotate the dimensions of data. For example, a user may even select data from a database table in the Microsoft Access database component of Microsoft Office, transfer it as a single object to Excel component as a rectangle of spreadsheet cell to DuFresne's system in order to display a form in different dimensions following user's desire.

As to claims 60 and 80, DuFresne fails to teach the claimed limitation "translating coordinate references to coordinate references of a system". However, Graefe teaches the above claimed limitations col. 1, liens 35-60; col. 2, lines 10-25.

As to claims 61 and 81, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "scaling text strings in accordance with a display device" as (col. 18, lines 35-45).

As to claims 62 and 82, DuFresne teaches the claimed limitation "joining and splitting text" as (col. 6, lines 50-65; col. 18, lines 35-45).

12. Claims 63, 64, 66, 83, 84, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hilster and further in view of Ferrel et al (USP 6230173).

As to claims 63 and 83, DuFresne and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "wherein the extraction instruction locates data in a report area and inserts data located into a selected tag in association with a report corresponding to the visual form of data". However, Ferrel teaches inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrel's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format.

As to claims 64 and 84, DuFresne discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction locates data in a direction relative .....to the visual form of data". However, Ferrel teaches inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrel's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a

document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format.

As to claims 66 and 86, DuFresne and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "the extraction inserts data into a selected tag in association with a report corresponding to the visual form of data based on data included in the report". ". However, Ferrel teaches inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrel's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format.

13. Claims 65 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hilster and further in view of Ferrel and Petty et al (USP 6342907).

As to claims 65 and 85, DuFresne and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 50, except the claimed limitation "the extraction instruction determines whether at least ...a Boolean tag in association with said report". However, Ferrel teaches the claimed limitation "the extraction determines whether at least one .....to visual form of data" as of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story

object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag (col. 4, lines 10-20). Petty teaches the claimed limitation "accordingly sets a Boolean tag in association with said report" as attribute tag is a Boolean set (col. 13, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ferrels's teaching of inserting a plurality of text portions indicative of a story object into a document, tagging each text portion of the story object with tag and Petty's teaching of attribute tag is a Boolean set to DuFresne's system in order to display a form on screen in proper format and allow a user to have certain actions during editing a template.

14. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne in view of Hilster and further in view of Sparks (USP 6167382).

As to claim 69, DuFresne and Hilster disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 67, except the claimed limitation "applying the template to data .....a print operation". However, Spark teaches a user can print out a home page, which includes a template (fig. 53).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Spark's teaching of a user can print out a home page which includes a template to DuFresne's system in order to allow a user to keep a template or a record and send a template to different locations without using electronic mail.

15. Claim 98 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilster.

As to claim 98, Hilster teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving content data and format data, wherein said format data is applied to said content data producing one of a display format and a print format of said content data" as (col. 1, lines 55-67) "applying a template to one of said display format and print format of said content data when said format data is applied to said content data" as (col. 5, lines 30-67).

Hilster does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "identifying, using said template, a portion of said content data when said content data is represented in one of said display format and said print format".

Hilster teaches normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents. The unstructured and formatted resume is represented as a visual form. A web page form is represented as a template (fig. 6C, col. 3, lines 5-35; col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hilster's teaching of normalizing the unstructured and formatted resume by using web page forms to associate each resume content with a fieldname, thereby creating a plurality of normalized resume contents in order to store data corresponding to the data strings from the form field into the database and to display content data of report in proper format to a user.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

17 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162
4/14/2005

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER